

REMARKS

In the Office Communication mailed October 10, 2003, the Examiner states that Applicants' election of species in Applicants' Response to Restriction/Election Requirement filed on October 7, 2003 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because the election did not include the claims believed by Applicants to be the elected claims as a result of the election.

In the response filed on October 7, 2003, Applicants elected the following components/species as required by the Examiner: pyroelectrics for claim 45; chemical microfluidics for claim 46; actuators for claim 56; pyroelectrics for claim 66; acoustic trapping for claim 72; pyroelectrics for claim 81; photoresist for claim 86; acoustic trapping for claim 89; pyroelectrics for claim 91; ceramics for claim 92; pyroelectrics for claim 93; and sorting an affixing structures for claim 96. In view of this election of species, claims 1-99 represent the elected claims for examination.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that "claims 97-101 are directed to chemical transport and fuel cells and therefore if these embodiments are not elected these claims will be non-elected." However, Applicants have not been required to elect a species within claims 97-99. Therefore, Applicants do not believe that claims 97-99 should be withdrawn from consideration in view of the election of species. Nonetheless, should the Examiner still determine that claims 97-99 represent non-elected embodiments, then claims 1-96 represent the elected claims for examination.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY LLP



Jeffrey N. Townes

Reg. No. 47,142

Dated: November 14, 2003

Customer No. 22204
NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th St., N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004
202.585.8000